

REMARKS

This application is under final rejection. Applicant has presented arguments below that Applicant believes should render the claims allowable. In the event, however, that the Examiner is not persuaded by Applicant's arguments, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner enter the amendments to clarify issues upon appeal.

Claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-15, 17-18 and 20-25 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 11 and 18 have been amended to incorporate the limitations of respective base claims. No new matter has been added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

I. Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 3, 11 and 18 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant has amended each of claims 3, 11, and 18 to include all limitations of corresponding base claims and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 11, and 18 are in condition for allowance.

II. The § 102/103 Rejections

Claims 11, 5, 9, 14, 17 and 20-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,313,822 ("McKay").

Claims 6-7 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKay in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,612,715 ("Karaki").

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKay in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,580,434 ("Curtis").

Attorney Docket: JP920000188US1/2951P

Claim 1 recites a computer system including an input section operable to receive user input selecting a zoom factor that specifies a pre-determined magnification amount for zooming in on an image displayed on a display screen of a display apparatus. The computer system further includes a resolution changing unit operable to zoom in on an image displayed on the display screen in accordance with the pre-determined magnification amount by changing a resolution of the display apparatus from a first resolution to a second resolution in response to the user input selecting the zoom factor.

A. McKay Fails To Disclose A Resolution Changing Unit Operable To Zoom In On An Image By Changing A Resolution of A Display Apparatus In Response To User Input Selecting The Zoom Factor

McKay discloses a method and apparatus for modifying screen resolution based on available memory (see Abstract). Referring to FIGs. 8 and 9, McKay discloses zoom control logic 810 (a software routine) that controls the identification of a correct zoom factor and the setting of hardware components (e.g., a screen) based on the zoom factor. In particular, the zoom control logic first identifies a current video resolution. The zoom control logic then creates a magnification table (used to increase horizontal screen resolution) or a zoom table (used to decrease the horizontal screen resolution) based on whether the identified video resolution is supported by available memory of a frame buffer. The zoom control logic then determines a new horizontal resolution for the screen using either the magnification table or the zoom table, and programs PLLs based on the new horizontal resolution (col. 13, line 38 – col. 14, line 16).

While McKay discloses altering the width of pixels by changing a horizontal screen resolution, McKay nevertheless fails to disclose a resolution changing unit operable to zoom in on an image by changing a resolution of a display apparatus in response to user input selecting

Attorney Docket: JP920000188US1/2951P

the zoom factor (emphasis added). Instead, (as discussed above) McKay clearly discloses that the zoom control logic 810 (a software routine) controls the identification of a correct zoom factor, and not a user. McKay, therefore, fails to disclose a resolution changing unit operable to zoom in on an image by changing a resolution of a display apparatus in response to user input selecting the zoom factor, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is allowable over McKay. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1, and are allowable for at least the reasons that apply to claim 1.

B. Other Independent Claims

Claims 9, 17 and 20-21 each incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 1. Claims 9, 17 and 20-21 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over McKay for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims 1-3, 5-11, 14-15, 17-18, and 20-25 are allowable over the cited references, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call Applicant's attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Kelvin M. Vivian
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 493-4540

January 13, 2006

Date